REMARKS

AMENDMENTS

Claims 12 and 32 were amended to correct typographical errors.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 12 was objected to because of insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the data electrode." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1, upon which claim 12 depends, recites, "... a data pattern electrically connected to a portion of the active pattern, said data pattern including a data electrode; ... ." Since the limitation of "a data electrode" was recited in claim 1, upon which claim 12 depends, and claim 12 recites "the data electrode," there is sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the data electrode" in claim 12.

Claim 28 was objected to because of insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the source electrode." This claim has been amended to obviate the objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as unpatentable over Yamazaki, et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,261,881 B1.

The Examiner states, "As shown in Fig. 3, Yamazaki et al. discloses a substrate 100 comprising:

a gate pattern 102 formed on a pixel region (comprising pixel matrix circuit) and a peripheral region (comprising CMOS circuit)...wherein the pixel region includes a plurality of pixels and the active pattern is comprised of amorphous silicon (col. 4, lines 36-42)..."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Yamazaki describes in col. 4, lines 35-42, 'In this specification, the term "initial semiconductor film" is a generical name for semiconductor films, and denotes typically a semiconductor film having an amorphous portion, e.g., an amorphous semiconductor film (such as an amorphous silicon film),' but fails to disclose that amorphous silicon composes the active pattern. Instead, the active pattern of Yamazaki is composed of **polysilicon** that is transformed from the amorphous silicon by irradiating infrared or ultraviolet light (see col. 10, line 62 to col. 11, line 31). Such transformation renders the polysilicon to have different characteristics as that of amorphous silicon. Therefore, Yamazaki does not teach "the active pattern that is comprised of amorphous silicon" as disclosed in claim 31. Accordingly, claim 31 is patently distinct and not rendered obvious by Yamazaki.

Since claim 32 depends from claim 31, claim 32 is distinguished from Yamazaki for the same reasons given above for claim 31.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 33-35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has argued above that the independent base claim 31 is allowable and, therefore, submits that the objection to claims 33-35 which depend from claim 31 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims, 1-35, are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: David W. Malloy
Reg. No. 56, 652
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
Fax: (516) 692-8889

FC/DWM:mel